

September 14, 2000

supply. Over the years, as we worked to advocate the construction of the Auburn Dam, I developed an even greater admiration and respect for Bob. Robert Doyle was not only a community leader, but he was also a great friend.

He is survived by his wife, Carmen, three children and five grandchildren. While we join his family and friends in mourning his passing, we also celebrate his life and cherish our associations with him. He clearly left his mark on all of us. Roseville, which was once a sleepy railroad town, is now a vibrant, well-planned community with award-winning parks, law enforcement, and city management. Its railroad past blends with its newer high-tech industry and thriving retail centers. Its residential areas include dynamic new developments as well as historic neighborhoods. In short, Roseville has experienced many great changes and Robert Doyle seemed to be at the heart of them all. He will be sorely missed.

May you rest in peace, Bob.

---

INTRODUCING THE SMALL  
BUSINESS LIABILITY RELIEF ACT

**HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 14, 2000*

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with a bipartisan group of original cosponsors, the Small Business Liability Relief Act to provide long overdue liability protection to individuals, families and small business owners who are innocent parties that have been wrongly and unfairly trapped in the litigation nightmare of the Superfund program for two decades. Superfund badly needs to be reformed to provide liability relief for innocent parties.

Today, I am saying enough is enough. It is time to provide relief to Barbara Williams, the former owner of Sunny Ray Restaurant in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania and to Greg Shierling, the owner of two McDonald's Restaurants in Quincy, Illinois, as well as thousands of others just like them whose only "crime" as small business owners was sending ordinary garbage to the local dump.

This bill only provides relief to innocent small businesses who never should have been brought into Superfund in the first place. First, it provides liability protection to small businesses who disposed of very small amounts of (110 gallons or 200 pounds) of waste. Second, it provides relief for small businesses who dispose of ordinary garbage. Third, it provides shelter from costly litigation for small businesses who dispose of de minimis amounts of waste and who otherwise face serious financial hardship.

It is my strong belief that we can pass this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support so that countless others can be spared the litigation nightmare that has already hit so many of America's small businesses.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONCERNING THE BOY SCOUTS OF  
AMERICA

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I voted against H.R. 4892, the bill to repeal the Boy Scouts of America Charter. I have a personal stake in this debate. As a boy, I benefited from everything the Scouts had to offer. While I worked my way towards earning the rank of Eagle, I learned the lessons of leadership, trustworthiness, loyalty, and more. Additionally, the memories I have, of sharing my interest in the outdoors with other boys my age will be with me for the rest of my life.

I opposed this bill for two reasons. Number one, I do not believe it is right to single out an individual group in legislative remedies. If change in any area of law occurs it should apply to all affected, not as, in this case, with only the Boy Scouts. It does not make sense to repeal the Scouts' charter and leave in place charters for groups such as the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists, National Ski Patrol System, Aviation Hall of Fame, or any of the roughly 90 other groups who hold charters.

If Ms. WOOLSEY's bill repealed all federal charters, it might represent a legitimate debate, unfortunately, this bill has a more narrow scope. According to a report published by the Library of Congress, the chartering by Congress, of organizations is essentially a 20th century practice and does not assign the group any governmental attributes. The report continues by stating, that the attraction of charter status for national organizations is that it tends to provide an "official" imprimatur to their activities. With these facts in mind, in 1989, the House Judiciary Committee decided to impose a moratorium on granting new charters.

However, the bill does not address this point, instead it focuses solely on the Boy Scouts. The intent of the bill is to pressure the Boy Scouts to change their practices, which brings me to my second point.

The First Amendment provides all American's the right of association. Whether a group preaches race-based hatred or the teachings of Christianity, their right to gather together has continually been protected by our nation's courts. In fact the courts have already ruled on the practices of the Boy Scouts. State courts in California, Connecticut, Oregon, Kansas, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit have ruled in the Boy Scouts favor.

On June 28, 2000, the Supreme Court affirmed the Constitutionally protected right of the Boy Scouts to set its own standards for membership and leadership. In his ruling Chief Justice Rehnquist stated, though alternative lifestyles are becoming more socially acceptable, "this is scarcely an argument for denying First Amendment protection to those who refuse to accept these views," he continued. "The First Amendment protects expression, be it of the popular variety or not." This decision, once again, reaffirms the Boy Scout's First Amendment rights.

18169

This bill attempts to circumvent the courts ruling by forcing the Boy Scouts to change their practices or else lose their charter. Upon reflection, I have come to agree with Chief Justice Rehnquist and the Supreme Court's, ruling, it should not be the federal government's role to alter the Boy Scout's values. More significantly, the, Boy Scout case is ultimately about something much bigger than scouting, it was a decision of whether or not our Constitutional right of association should remain intact. Passing this bill would have had just the opposite effect and for this reason, I voted against the bill.

---

ESTUARY RESTORATION ACT OF  
2000

SPEECH OF

**HON. NITA M. LOWEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1775, the Estuary Restoration Act. This important piece of legislation provides a strong framework and strategy for protecting, maintaining and strengthening the nation's estuaries.

Estuaries are essential and fragile ecosystems that deserve a comprehensive plan to ensure their long-term viability. They are home to thousands of species of aquatic plant and animal life. They are also some of the most productive commercial fisheries in the world. And, millions of Americans flock to estuarine areas for vacations and recreation.

The legislation we are considering today gives us another tool to use for estuary preservation and restoration. This bill streamlines financing for estuary projects and integrates existing federal and non-federal programs. The bill also gives priority to those estuaries currently part of a management plan or pollution mitigation plan. This is so important that my colleague, ROSA DELAURIO, and I introduced H.R. 1096, to provide special funding to States for implementation of national estuary conservation and management plans. I hope that with the passage of this legislation we can continue to provide the funding necessary to truly safeguard these essential natural resources.

Unfortunately, I can also tell you, from recent experience, about the tenuous nature of estuaries. Many of my constituents live near and fish from Long Island Sound. The Sound, until recently, was the third largest lobster fishery in the United States, behind Maine and Massachusetts. But the last two seasons have been a disaster for the Long Island Sound fishery. All of the lobsters in Long Island Sound have died. Lobster harvesters are finding their traps empty and their lives thrown into turmoil. The cause of this die-off is being studied and investigated, and it reinforces the need for greater protection of the nation's estuary habitats.

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support it.